DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 382 112 HE 028 313

AUTHOR McManigal, Shirley A.
TITLE Faculty Evaluation in a Professional School.
PUB DATE 7 Nov 94
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Center for Educational Development and Assessment Preconference Workshop "Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System" (San Juan, PR, November 7-8, 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Allied Health Occupations Education; *Clinical Experience; Dental Schools; *Evaluation Methods; *Faculty Evaluation; Faculty Promotion; Higher Education; Medical Education; Nursing Education; Pharmaceutical Education; *Portfolio Assessment; Portfolios (Background Materials); *Professional Education; Tenure
IDENTIFIERS *Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the faculty evaluation process at the Health Sciences Center at Texas Tech University. It covers the Center's five disciplines: allied health, dentistry, medicine, nursing, and pharmacy. Faculty members in these disciplines must usually have certification and/or licensure in the profession as well as typical academic qualifications (usually a doctoral degree). At Texas Tech an evaluation matrix has been developed which is used in the mentoring and development process. For the annual review by the department chair and for the promotion and tenure process, each applicant prepares a portfolio using a prescribed format, including such items as conference programs, seminar announcements, letters of appointment, lists of society offices, letters of commendation, and teaching evaluation summaries. In addition to covering the usual areas of teaching, research, and service, the evaluation includes the professional program component of clinical practice. This faculty evaluation system was compared with those of six other professional schools and found to be quite similar. Attachments provide more detail on the procedural steps of the evaluation process, an outline of the matrix components, and a quantitative scale for weighing the various components. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 382 112

FACULTY EVALUATION IN A PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL

BY
SHIRLEY A. MCMANIGAL, PH.D.
PROFESSOR AND DEAN
SCHOOL OF ALLIED HEALTH
TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY HEALTH SCIENCES CENTER

HE 02P 313

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Shirley A. McManigal

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FACULTY EVALUATION IN A PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL

BY
SHIRLEY A. MCMANIGAL, PH.D.
PROFESSOR AND DEAN
SCHOOL OF ALLIED HEALTH
TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY HEALTH SCIENCES CENTER

ALLIED HEALTH IS A GENERIC TERM WHICH ENCOMPASSES MORE THAN ONE HUNDRED DIFFERENT DISCIPLINES. EXAMPLES OF ALLIED HEALTH DISCIPLINES ARE: AUDIOLOGY, CARDIOPULMONARY SCIENCE, CLINICAL LABORATORY SCIENCE, COMMUNICATION DISORDERS, CYTOTECHNOLOGY, DENTAL HYGIENE, DIETETICS, EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES, ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH, EXPRESSIVE THERAPIES, GERONTOLOGY, HEALTH ADMINISTRATION, HEALTH INFORMATION MANAGEMENT, OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY, PHYSICAL THERAPY, PHYSICIAN ASSISTANT, AND RADIATION ONCOLOGY.

THE EDUCATIONAL LEVEL VARIES, SO THOSE DISCIPLINES WITH MOSTLY TECHNICAL CURRICULA ARE INSTITUTIONALLY AFFILIATED WITH COMMUNITY COLLEGES. THE BACCALAUREATE AND GRADUATE LEVEL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS ARE HOUSED ON GENERAL ACADEMIC CAMPUSES AND/OR ACADEMIC HEALTH CENTERS. THIS PRESENTATION WILL FOCUS PRIMARILY UPON FACULTY EVALUATION FOR PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS IN ACADEMIC HEALTH CENTERS. IT IS TYPICAL THAT THE SCHOOLS REPRESENTED ARE ALLIED HEALTH, DENTISTRY, MEDICINE, NURSING AND PHARMACY. THE APPROACH TO FACULTY EVALUATION WOULD ALSO BE APPROPRIATE IN A PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL LOCATED ON A GENERAL ACADEMIC CAMPUS, SINCE THE FACULTY IN THESE DISCIPLINES MUST

HOLD DUAL CREDENTIALS: THE GRADUATE DEGREE PLUS CERTIFICATION AND/OR LICENSURE AS CLINICIANS.

SOME OF THE ALLIED HEALTH PROFESSIONS, SUCH AS COMMUNICATION DISORDERS OR SPEECH AND HEARING SCIENCES, HAVE HISTORICALLY BEEN A PART OF ACADEMIC CAMPUSES. OTHERS, SUCH AS OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY, ARE FAIRLY YOUNG AS ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES. THE PROFESSIONS DIFFER IN THE TYPE OF CLINICAL PRACTICE AND THEIR CURRICULUM PLANS REFLECT THOSE DIFFERENCES. IN GENERAL, THE CURRICULUM IN CLINICAL DISCIPLINES INCLUDES A LENGTHY DIDACTIC PORTION, AN ON-CAMPUS LABORATORY EXPERIENCE AND AN OFF-CAMPUS CLINICAL PRACTICUM. FACULTY TEACH IN THE FIRST TWO PORTIONS OF THE CURRICULUM AND SERVE AS CONSULTANTS/FACULTY ADVISERS DURING THE CLINICAL PRACTICA.

AS COMPARED WITH OUR COLLEAGUES IN THE MORE CLASSICALLY ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES, ALLIED HEALTH FACULTY ARE UNIQUELY QUALIFIED. THE TYPICAL EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION AT THE DOCTORAL LEVEL OR, MINIMALLY, AT THE MASTER'S DEGREE LEVEL IS EXPECTED. IN ADDITION, THE FACULTY MEMBER MUST HAVE CERTIFICATION AND/OR LICENSURE IN THE PROFESSION AND MUST HAVE CURRENT CLINICAL COMPETENCY. HOWEVER, THE EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION HAS BEEN TARGETED SOMEWHAT TOWARD THE PERFORMANCE OF THE ROLES AND FUNCTIONS WITHIN THE HEALTH CARE SERVICES OF THE PROFESSION. FACULTY BRING THE PERSPECTIVE OF "THE REAL WORLD" OF CLINICAL PRACTICE WITH THEM. ADDITIONALLY, IN ORDER TO MAINTAIN THE APPROPRIATE CURRENT COMPETENCY AT AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL TO MAINTAIN CREDIBILITY AS AN INSTRUCTOR, THE FACULTY MEMBER MUST BE ACTIVELY ENGAGED IN PATIENT SERVICES.

IN ACADEMIC HEALTH CENTERS, TWO MAJOR EVALUATION APPROACHES TO THE PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCESS ARE USED. IN SOME INSTANCES, THE EVALUATION OF FACULTY IN ALL DISCIPLINES IS DONE AT THE INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL. SO THE STAGES OF EVALUATION ARE DEPARTMENTAL AND INSTITUTIONAL AND FACULTY MEMBERS IN ALL SCHOOLS ARE EVALUATED BY THE SAME CRITERIA. IN OTHER INSTANCES, EACH COLLEGE OR SCHOOL IS AUTONOMOUS IN TERMS OF ITS PROCESS, EVALUATION IS AT THE DEPARTMENTAL AND SCHOOL LEVELS AND FACULTY MEMBERS WITHIN ONLY ONE SCHOOL ARE EVALUATED. ARGUMENTS CAN BE MADE FOR THE VALIDITY OF EACH PROCESS.

THE SCHOOL OF ALLIED HEALTH AT TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY HEALTH SCIENCES CENTER HAS FIVE DIFFERENT DISCIPLINES REPRESENTED. EACH OF THE DEPARTMENTS REPRESENTS A PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE AND EACH HAS A BODY OF KNOWLEDGE SPECIFIC TO THAT PROFESSION. COMMON TO THE DISCIPLINES IS THE EDUCATIONAL FORMAT PREVIOUSLY DESCRIBED. THE DEGREE LEVELS INCLUDE BOTH BACCALAUREATE AND MASTER'S DEGREE PROGRAMS.

THE SCHOOL'S EVALUATION FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE IS A SOMEWHAT AUTONOMOUS PROCESS. THE FIRST EVALUATION OF PORTFOLIOS IS AT THE DEPARTMENTAL LEVEL. COMMITTEE VOTE RESULTS ARE RECORDED AND PRESENTED TO THE CHAIR WHO ALSO RECORDS A VOTE FOR EACH CANDIDATE FILE. NEXT, THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE, WHICH IS COMPOSED OF THE TENURED FACULTY AND REPRESENTS VARIOUS DISCIPLINES, REVIEWS THE PORTFOLIOS AND RECORDS ITS VOTES. THE ENTIRE RECORD TO THIS POINT IS REVIEWED BY THE DEAN WHO RECORDS A VOTE. FOLLOWING THE DEAN'S REVIEW, THE PROVOST

COMPLETES A REVIEW AND A VOTE. THE FINAL VOTE IS MADE BY THE PRESIDENT AND THE COMPLETED RECORD OF EVALUATION IS PRESENTED TO THE BOARD OF REGENTS. CONCURRENT EVALUATION PROCESSES OCCUR IN THE SCHOOLS OF MEDICINE, NURSING AND PHARMACY.
THE SCHOOL OF ALLIED HEALTH ADMINISTRATIVE TEAM RECOGNIZED THE NEED FOR A COMPREHENSIVE FACULTY EVALUATION PLAN; ONE WHICH WOULD ALLOW EVALUATION FOR PURPOSES OF MENTORING AND DEVELOPMENT OF FACULTY, FOR MERIT INCREASES IN SALARY, FOR PROMOTION AND FOR TENURE. TAKING AN ENTIRE ACADEMIC YEAR FOR THE PROCESS, WE DEVELOPED THE PLAN IN STAGES OF DRAFTS AND REVIEWS. AN ADMINISTRATIVE TEAM COMPOSED OF THE DEAN, ASSOCIATE DEANS, CHAIRS AND PROGRAM DIRECTORS DEVELOPED AN INITIAL DRAFT WHICH WAS THEN ROUTED TO EACH INDIVIDUAL FACULTY MEMBER FOR INPUT. INCORPORATING THAT INPUT, A SECOND DRAFT WAS PREPARED AND ROUTED. FINALLY, A THIRD DRAFT WAS SIMILARLY PROCESSED AND A REVIEW BY UNIVERSITY COUNSEL WAS INVITED. THUS, IT WAS A LEGALLY ACCEPTABLE DOCUMENT WITH SIGNIFICANT INPUT FROM ALL CONCERNED PARTIES. IT IS AN ESSENTIAL THAT THOSE WHO WILL BE EVALUATED HAVE INPUT INTO THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROCESS.

THE EVALUATION MATRIX DEVELOPED IS USED IN THE MENTORING AND DEVELOPMENT PROCESS ON AN ANNUAL BASIS. EACH FACULTY MEMBER MEETS WITH THE DEPARTMENTAL CHAIR FOR THE PURPOSE OF GOAL SETTING AND A DISCUSSION OF THE CONTRIBUTIONS HE OR SHE CAN MAKE TO THE DEPARTMENT. AN OPEN SHARING OCCURS SO THAT THE CHAIR CAN EXPLAIN THE DIRECTIONS PLANNED FOR THE DEPARTMENT FOR THE ACADEMIC YEAR AND THE FACULTY MEMBER CAN RECOGNIZE HIS OR HER PLACE IN THE JOINT EFFORT. A SECOND PART OF THE PROCESS FOR THE

CONTINUING FACULTY MEMBER IS A RETROSPECTIVE REVIEW OF THE PAST ACADEMIC YEAR AND THE DEGREE TO WHICH GOALS SET WERE MET. A WRITTEN SUMMARY OF EACH MEETING IS PREPARED BY THE CHAIR. THE FACULTY MEMBER REVIEWS THE SUMMARY AND INDICATES CONCURRENCE OR DISAGREEMENT BY SIGNATURE. IN THE CASE OF DISAGREEMENT, A STATEMENT IS PREPARED BY THE FACULTY MEMBER. ALL DOCUMENTS ARE FILED FOR FUTURE REFERENCE.

FOR THE ANNUAL REVIEW BY THE CHAIR AND FOR THE PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCESS, EACH APPLICANT PREPARES A PORTFOLIO, UTILIZING THE EVALUATION MATRIX COMPONENTS. THROUGHOUT EACH ACADEMIC YEAR, ADDITIONS ARE MADE TO THE FILES WHICH WILL BE USED TO PREPARE THE PORTFOLIO. ITEMS SUCH AS CONFERENCE PROGRAMS, SEMINAR ANNOUNCEMENTS, LETTERS OF APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEES, LISTS OF SOCIETY OFFICERS, LETTERS OF COMMENDATION AND TEACHING EVALUATION SUMMARIES ARE IMPORTANT COMPONENTS OF THESE FILES. PORTFOLIO PREPARATION FOLLOWS A PRESCRIBED FORMAT, SO THAT ALL PORTFOLIOS WILL BE UNIFORM AND REVIEW COMMITTEES MAY EXPECT THE SAME ORDER OF ITEMS INCLUDED.

THIS LINKAGE BETWEEN THE FACULTY EVALUATION MATRIX AND ITS UTILIZATION FOR MENTORING AND DEVELOPMENT REVIEW AND FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW HAS BEEN VIEWED BY FACULTY MEMBERS AS EFFECTIVE AND CONCISE. IT PROVIDES CLARITY OF PROCESS AND ALLOWS FOR CHAIR-FACULTY MEMBER AGREEMENT UPON PRIORITIES. IT ALLOWS THE INDIVIDUAL FACULTY MEMBER TO CHOOSE AREAS OF EMPHASIS IN ACTIVITIES.

AS YOU WOULD EXPECT, OUR FACULTY EVALUATION MATRIX INCLUDES THE USUAL ACADEMIC TRINITY OF

TEACHING, RESEARCH AND SERVICE. IT ALSO INCLUDES THE PROFESSIONAL PROGRAM COMPONENT OF CLINICAL PRACTICE. IN PROFESSIONAL PROGRAMS OTHER THAN ALLIED HEALTH, CLINICAL PRACTICE WOULD MEAN THE SAME THING--PATIENT SERVICES PROVISION. IT IS TYPICAL IN HEALTH RELATED PROFESSIONS THAT FACULTY MEMBERS MUST MAINTAIN CLINICAL COMPETENCY AND DO SO BY PROVIDING PATIENT SERVICES. FEES COLLECTED FOR THESE SERVICES ARE DEPOSITED INTO A PRACTICE INCOME PLAN BUDGET. SALARY AUGMENTATION AND FACULTY MEMBER PERQUISITES ARE PROVIDED FROM THESE FUNDS. SUCH AMENITIES MIGHT INCLUDE FUNDED TRAVEL FOR CONFERENCE PARTICIPATION, PURCHASE OF SPECIALIZED RESEARCH EQUIPMENT, PAYMENT OF PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE FEES AND MEMBERSHIP FEES FOR PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PAYMENT OF EXPENSES FOR TRAVEL WHICH EXCEED THE LEVEL OF PAYMENT ALLOWABLE IN STATE SUPPORTED INSTITUTIONS. EVALUATION OF CLINICAL PRACTICE IS DETAILED WITHIN THE MATRIX AND INCLUDES THE NEGOTIATIONS WHICH LEAD TO A CONTRACT FOR SERVICES AS WELL AS THE TYPE AND CONDITIONS OF SERVICE PROVISION.

HOW DOES OUR FACULTY EVALUATION SYSTEM COMPARE WITH THOSE OF OTHER PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS? DURING PREPARATION OF THIS PAPER, INFORMATION WAS GATHERED FROM SIX OTHER SCHOOLS FOR THE PURPOSE OF COMPARING (A) METHODOLOGIES OF EVALUATION, (B) PRIORITIZATION OF FACULTY MEMBER CONTRIBUTIONS AND (C) DEGREE TO WHICH CLINICAL PRACTICE WAS VALUED. IN ALL CASES, CLINICAL PRACTICE WAS IN INTEGRAL PART OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS. SLIGHT VARIATIONS IN METHODOLOGY WERE SEEN AND THE DEGREE TO WHICH VARIOUS COMPONENTS IN THE EVALUATION PROCESS WERE QUANTIFIED DIFFERED. METHODS OF DOCUMENTATION ALSO DIFFERED BUT ALL REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION OF EFFORT.

IN ONE OR TWO CASES, IT APPEARS THAT QUANTIFICATION OF EFFORT IS EXTREME.

A RECENT ARTICLE IN ACADEMIC MEDICINE, JOURNAL OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN MEDICAL COLLEGES (VOLUME 69, NUMBER SIX; JUNE, 1994) IS ENTITLED "FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATION VIEWS OF PROBLEMS IN FACULTY EVALUATION" (ROBERT F. JONES, PH.D. AND JANET D. FROOM, M.A.). A SURVEY OF 126 ACCREDITED U.S. MEDICAL SCHOOLS AND 16 AFFILIATED CANADIAN SCHOOLS WAS SUMMARIZED IN THE ARTICLE. OF THE RESPONDENTS, 27% SAID THAT "INADEQUATE METHODS TO EVALUATE TEACHING" WAS A PROBLEM. EIGHTEEN PER CENT FELT THAT THERE WERE "SPECIFIC PROBLEMS WITH STUDENT EVALUATIONS", WHILE 14% SAID THAT THERE WERE "INADEQUATE METHODS TO EVALUATE RESEARCH". A TOTAL OF 11% IDENTIFIED "INADEQUATE METHODS TO EVALUATE CLINICAL SERVICE". SURPRISINGLY, 10% REPORTED "FACULTY EVALUATION NOT LINKED TO SALARY/COMPENSATION". A CONSENSUS OPINION SEEMED TO BE THAT SIMPLY ASSESSING WORTH ON THE BASIS OF FEES GENERATED WAS NOT APPROPRIATE.

IN ONE MEDICAL SCHOOL I CONTACTED, ONE PROBLEM WHICH OCCURRED ANNUALLY WAS THAT SOME CLINICIANS WERE SO BUSY WITH CLINICAL PRACTICE THERE WAS NOT ADEQUATE RESEARCH EFFORT TO MEET EXPECTATIONS FOR PROMOTION OR TENURE. THIS WAS ESPECIALLY TRUE IN MEDICAL SPECIALTIES IN HIGH DEMAND. THIS WOULD BE TO THE FREQUENT PROBLEM ON GENERAL ACADEMIC CAMPUSES WHEREIN A FACULTY MEMBER OVERLOADED WITH STUDENT ADVISEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES DOESN'T MEET PROMOTION OR TENURE EXPECTATIONS IN THE AREA OF RESEARCH.

IN SUMMARY, FACULTY EVALUATION IN A PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL IS SIMILAR TO FACULTY EVALUATION ELSEWHERE IN ACADEME, BUT REQUIRES A DIFFERENT SET OF VALUES. THE INCLUSION OF CLINICAL PRACTICE IS AN APPROPRIATE ONE. A TIMELY AND MEANINGFUL PROCESS IS ESSENTIAL.

SCHOOL OF ALLIED HEALTH

FACULTY EVALUATION MATRIX

PROCEDURE

The purposes of faculty evaluation are to assure that the faculty members and their administrative officers share a clear understanding of expectations and requirements of performance and to assure that fair and equitable decisions are made on retention, promotion, tenure and merit increases. In order to provide that clear understanding and to promote an orderly documentation of the process, the School of Allied Health Faculty Evaluation Matrix will be used in the following manner:

1. Near the beginning of each academic or contract year, each faculty member will meet with the department Chair. The meeting will be for the purpose of establishing mutually agreeable goals for performance by the faculty member during the academic year. The discussion will include goals in the areas designated in the evaluation matrix, namely: teaching and associated duties; research-directed, scholarly or creative activities; service to the community; clinical practice; administrative assignments and other activities. A letter of summary of points discussed and agreements reached will be written by the Chair to the faculty member; copies will be retained by the faculty member, the Chair and the Dean.

2. During the year, the faculty member will keep a log of activities which pertain to each category, with appropriate documentation, such as letters, memos, programs from conferences, published papers, etc.

3. Near the end of the academic year, the department Chair will simultaneously arrange an interview with the faculty member and ask for the file of documentation and any supporting statements the faculty member might want to include for review. Prior to the actual meeting, the Chair will review the documentation and any supporting statements presented and consider the application of the evaluation matrix to the specific faculty member's performance. It will be the prerogative of the Chair to determine the weighting of individual accomplishments within the context of the specific professional discipline. At the meeting, the discussion will focus on (1) the application of the matrix to the documentation and (2) the extent to which previously determined goals were met, exceeded or not met and the reasons for variation. A summary letter of the discussion will be written by the Chair to the faculty member; copies will be retained by the faculty member, the Chair and the Dean. This end-of-year review will give faculty and

administrators a basis for planning for the next academic year and for assessing/planning progress toward promotion and/or tenure.

4. With regard to summary letters written by the Chair to the faculty member, if the faculty member does not agree with the letter's content, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to respond in writing and with full explanation of the disagreement. Copies of such response will be retained by the faculty member, the Chair and the Dean.

TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY HEALTH SCIENCES CENTER
SCHOOL OF ALLIED HEALTH
FACULTY EVALUATION PLAN

Purposes:

I. To document meaningful data upon which to base fair and equitable decisions on salary, promotion, tenure and retention for faculty within the School of Allied Health.

II. To provide feedback to the faculty members in order to recognize their contributions and to encourage their development.

III. To assure quality in the faculty and enhance the growth and development of the School of Allied Health.

IV. To assure that faculty and administration share the same understandings of the evaluation processes.

Objectives:

I. To provide quantification of faculty performance in areas which are quantifiable and to provide documentation in areas which are not quantifiable.

II. To assure that faculty have a scope of activities in the areas of teaching, research-directed, scholarly and creative activity, clinical practice and service, administration (where applicable) and other activities which will provide the opportunity to achieve promotion and/or tenure.

III. To document the standards of performance which will be used in evaluation for decision making.

Design:

I. The evaluation will encompass activities encompassed within these categories:

A. Teaching and associated activities
B. Research-directed activities
C. Scholarly and creative activities
D. Service, including professional society, university and community activities
E. Clinical Practice activities
F. Administrative activities
G. Other activities

Application:
For all faculty, strength is required in two categories:

I. **Teaching and associated activities**
II. **Research-Directed and/or Scholarly and creative activities.**

Strength in other categories add to positive consideration.

Matrix Components:

I. Teaching and associated activities

A. Design of curriculum, objectives or learning goals and student outcome measurement methodologies for new courses or portions of courses taught within the department or School and for new courses or portions of courses taught as a guest lecturer
B. Development of syllabi for courses taught
C. Where applicable, development of laboratory manuals for courses taught
D. Major revision of course curriculum as approved by departmental chair and/or curriculum committee
E. Coordination of course utilizing School of Medicine or other contracted lecturers
F. Teaching of courses or portions of courses
G. Presentation of guest lectures
H. Development of innovative teaching techniques or aids to teaching
I. Student advisement by instructor
J. Other

II. Research-Directed activities

A. Student, Master's level
   1. Major professor/Chair of graduate/thesis committee
   2. Committee member
B. Student, Doctoral level
   1. Major professor/Chair of the graduate/dissertation committee
   2. Committee member
C. Consultant to external institution/agency

III. Scholarly and creative activity related to the profession

A. Abstracts, book reviews or papers submitted for publication in peer reviewed journals
B. Abstracts, book reviews or papers submitted for publication in other journals
C. Monographs, chapters and books submitted for publication
D. Abstracts, book reviews or papers submitted and accepted for publication in peer reviewed journals
E. Abstracts, book reviews or papers submitted and accepted for publication in other journals
F. Monographs, chapters and books submitted and accepted for publication
G. Abstracts, book reviews or papers published in peer reviewed journals
H. Abstracts, book reviews or papers published in other journals
I. Monographs, chapters and books published
J. Development of software video tapes or other electronic media for use in the SAH or for external distribution
K. Small grant proposal written, submitted, funded
   1. principal investigator
   2. participant
L. Major grant/proposal written and submitted, funded
   1. principal investigator
   2. participant
M. Presentation of paper at an international, national, regional, state or local meeting
N. Workshop presentation at an international, national, regional, state or local meeting
O. Continuing education presentation
P. Continuing education workshop coordinator
Q. Editorial duties as editor for professional journal or book
R. Editorial duties as reviewer for professional journal or book
S. Grant proposal reviewer duties
T. Development and submission of product/device/other for patent or copyright
U. Patent or copyright awarded
V. Other

IV. Service, including professional society, university and community activities

A. Committee/Board Chair

1. Department
2. School

3. HSC
4. TTU
5. Professional Society; international, national, regional, state or local
6. Funding Agency
7. Community Agency
8. Accrediting Agency
9. Other

B. Committee/Board member

1. Department
2. School
3. HSC
4. TTU
5. Professional Society; international, national, regional, state or local
6. Funding Agency
7. Community Agency
8. Accrediting Agency
9. Other

C. Officer

1. Professional Society at international, national, regional, state or local level
2. Community Agency/Organization
3. Accrediting Agency
4. Other

D. Evaluator duties for accrediting agency
E. Recruitment/career information activities
F. Presentation to community group
G. Papers/articles on topics related to the profession and published in non-professional journals, newsletters, newspapers, magazines, etc.
H. Other

V. Administrative activities

A. School Director/Associate Dean/Assistant Dean
B. Department Chair
C. Program Director
D. Clinical Coordinator
E. Major administrative assignment
F. Student advisement

G. Self-study document preparation
   1. Major assignment
   2. Minor assignment

H. Served as School representative
   1. HSC function
   2. TTU function
   3. Government agency function
   4. Community function
   5. Ad hoc group at international, national, regional, state or local level

I. Other

VI. Clinical practice

A. Sole responsibility for provision of services
B. Shared responsibility for provision of services
C. Occasional provision of services
D. Initiates service
E. Initiates and/or negotiates contract
G. Other

VII. Other faculty activities, including faculty development

Definitions:

Syllabus	A manual or handout which includes: an outline of the content of the curriculum or course content, clearly stated learning objectives a schedule of lectures which includes topics and dates and may include reading assignments, the manner in which the grade will be derived, and other pertinent data. The syllabus should serve the purpose of clearly defining the requirements for successful completion of the course.
Innovative Teaching Technique	A technique which is new or has not been used before for the specific type of learning experience.
Aids to teaching	Devices which are an adjunct to the usual teaching tools (such as, but not limited to, chalkboard, handouts, overhead projections, kodachrome slides, filmstrips) for a particular course or curriculum.
Scholarly	Indicating profound knowledge or knowledge above the level of the average participant; showing originality of thought or investigative thought, as evidenced by research, writing for publication, development of software, products or devices or other tangible results.
Creative	Resulting from originality of thought and productive of tangible results.
Service	Activities which enhance professional society, University or Community group programs as well as those of the department, School or Health Sciences Center.
Strength	Significant performance or activity at acceptable, excellent or outstanding level of quantity and quality
Small or Major Grant	A case-by-case judgment call by the Department Chair Major based on funding source and amount and effort by the faculty member.

Evaluation Quantitative Scale

Activities	Maximum Points
Teaching and Associated Duties	100
Research-Directed, Scholarly or Creative Activities	50
Service	25
Clinical Practice and/or Administrative Responsibilities	50
Other	25